| 1 | | |
|----|--|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | JERRY DILLINGHAM, | Case No. 1:18-cv-00507-AWI-SAB (PC) |
| 11 | Plaintiff, | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND |
| 12 | , | RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EMERGENCY |
| 13 | v. N. EMERSON, et al., | ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF |
| 14 | Defendants. | (ECF Nos. 88, 90) |
| 15 | Defendants. | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Plaintiff Jerry Dillingham is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in | |
| 18 | this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States | |
| 19 | Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. | |
| 20 | On September 17, 2020, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued findings and | |
| 21 | recommendations recommending that Plaintiff's motion for emergency administrative relief be | |
| 22 | denied. (ECF No. 90.) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and | |
| 23 | contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after | |
| 24 | service. (Id. at 3.) No objections were filed and the time to do so has expired. | |
| 25 | In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a | |
| 26 | de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that the | |
| 27 | findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. | |
| 28 | /// | |

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The findings and recommendations (ECF No. 90) are adopted in full; and 2. Plaintiff's motion for emergency administrative relief (ECF No. 88) is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 16, 2020 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE